



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

94
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,867	12/23/2003	B.J. Herbison	SUN03-12(040036)	2764
7590 Barry W. Chapin, Esq. CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C. Westborough Office Park 1700 West Park Drive Westborough, MA 01581		04/24/2007	EXAMINER HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/747,867	HERBISON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Doug Hutton	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-18 and 22-37 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-18 and 22-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Responses dated 09/18/2006 and 02/01/2007, Applicant amended the Specification, amended the Abstract, amended Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 12-16, 18 and 25-31, added new Claims 32-37, cancelled Claims 3 and 19-21, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 05/12/2006.

Based on Applicant's amendments, the objections to the Abstract and the Specification previously set forth are withdrawn. Based on Applicant's amendments, the objections to the Claims previously set forth are withdrawn.

Based on Applicant's amendments, the rejections for Claims 15-28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 101 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Based on Applicant's amendments, the prior art rejections for Claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term "page36" on Page 10, Line 19 should be amended to — page_36 — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 36.1 through 36.4 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Line 6, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9); 26-1 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Line 9, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9); 30-1 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Line 15, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9); 36-11 and 36-12 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Lines 16-17, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9). These element numbers are located in additional portions of the Specification, and all must be corrected.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*identified*” in Line 6 should be amended to — identifieddetermined — so that the term corresponds to previously recited claim language (see Line 5).

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*parsing and verification of the display data*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended to — *parsing and verification of*verifying the display data — so that the phrase is grammatically correct.

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*template*” in Lines 2 and 3 (two occurrences) should be amended to — pagetemplate — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Claim 1, Line 2).

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- There is no antecedent basis for the “*syntactical elements*” in the phrase “*in which the syntactical elements further comprise XML tags*” in Lines 2-3. The claim should be amended to depend from Claim 7, which recites “*syntactical elements*.”

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*dynamic content*” in Line 4 should be amended to — the *dynamic content* — because the “*dynamic content*” is previously recited in the claims (see Claim 1, Line 4).
- The term “*token*” in Lines 7, 12 and 13 (three occurrences) should be amended to — tokens — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 1).
- A tab indentation should be inserted before the term “*inserting*” in Line 13 so that the claim is consistently formatted.

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*identifying a javabean component operable to process the metadata token*” in Line 2 should be amended to indicate whether there is a “*javabean component*” for **every** “*metadata token*” or **only some** of the “*metadata tokens*,” since the claims previously recite that multiple “*metadata tokens*” are parsed (see Claim 10, Lines 1-3).

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*page descriptors*” in Line 5 should be amended to — at least one *page descriptor[[s]]* — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 2). Additionally, Claim 14 should be amended to correspond to any amendment of Claim 13.

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*preference*” in Line 3 should be amended to — preferences — so the limitation is grammatically correct.

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*retrieved*” in Line 11 should be amended to — retrieved fetched — so that the claim language is consistent (see Lines 10 and 12).
- The phrase “*operable to process display data*” in Line 13 should be amended to — operable to process the display data — because the “*display data*” is previously recited in the claim (see Line 10).
- The phrase “*parsing and verification of the display data*” in Line 14 should be amended to — parsing and verification of verifying the display data — so that the phrase is grammatically correct.
- The term “*template*” in Lines 15 and 17 (two occurrences) should be amended to — page template — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 4).

Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The claim should be cancelled, because the claim depends upon Claim 15 and the limitation recited in the claim is previously recited in Claim 15 (see Lines 22-24).

Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*identified*” in Line 6 should be amended to — identifieddetermined — so that the term corresponds to previously recited claim language (see Line 5).

Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*dynamic content*” in Line 3 should be amended to — the *dynamic content* — because the “*dynamic content*” is previously recited in the claims (see Claim 15, Line 7).
- The term “*token*” in Lines 6, 12 and 14 (three occurrences) should be amended to — tokens — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 2).

Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*identify a javabean component operable to process the metadata token*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended to indicate whether there is a “*javabean component*” for **every** “*metadata token*” or **only some** of the “*metadata tokens*,” since the claims previously recite that multiple “*metadata tokens*” are parsed (see Claim 24, Lines 1-3). Additionally, Claim 27 should be amended to correspond to any amendment of Claim 26.

Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*according to a predetermined syntax*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended to — according to [[a]]the predetermined syntax — because the “predetermined syntax” is previously mentioned in the claims (see Claim 15, Line 13).
- The phrase “*page descriptors*” in Line 5 should be amended to — at least one page descriptor[[s]] — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 2). Applicant should not strike through the letter “s” of the term “*descriptors*” when making the amendment. See 37 C.F.R. 1.121.

Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*preference*” in Line 3 should be amended to — preferences — so the limitation is grammatically correct.

Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*parsing and verification of the display data*” in Lines 12-13 should be amended to — parsing and verification ofverifying the display data — so that the phrase is grammatically correct.
- The phrase “*fetched output data*” in Line 14 should be amended to — fetchedretrieved output data — so that the claim terminology is consistent (see Line 13).

- A tab indentation should be removed before the phrase “*computer program code for building the output report*” in Line 18 so that the claim is consistently formatted.
- The phrase “*operable to interpret the predetermined syntax into the syntax of the output page*” in Lines 20-21 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for either the recited “*syntax*” of the output page or the recited “*output page*.”
- The phrase “*further comprising*” in Line 21 should be deleted because it is unnecessary.
- The phrase “*invoking the javabean components*” in Line 22 should be amended to — computer program code for invoking the javabean components — so that the claim language is consistent.
- The phrase “*the retrieved display data 58*” in Line 23 should be amended to — the retrieved display data [[58]] — because it appears to include a typographic error.
- The phrase “*generating the dynamic content*” in Line 24 should be amended to — computer program code for generating the dynamic content — so that the claim language is consistent.
- A tab indentation should be inserted before the term “*generating*” in Line 24 so that the claim is consistently formatted.

Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*processor*” (see Line 2) has no antecedent basis and does not correspond to the previously recited portion of the claim because no computer, nor any other machine comprising a processor, is previously recited in the claim.
- The phrase “*the dynamic content further comprising java server pages referencing metalinguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report;*” in Lines 8-10 should be deleted because the phrase is subsequently recited in Lines 23-25 and is better located there.
- The phrase “*parsing and verification of the display data*” in Line 14 should be amended to — *parsing and verification of verifying* the display data — so that the phrase is grammatically correct.
- The term “*template*” in Lines 15 and 16 (two occurrences) should be amended to — page template — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 4).
- The phrase “*and generating further comprising*” in Line 15 should be amended to — and said generating further comprising — because the “*generating*” is previously recited in the claim (see Line 11).
- The claim language recited in Lines 17-19 should be moved to a location that directly follows the term “*template*,” in Line 16, because this language further modifies the language recited in Lines 11-16. Similarly, the claim language recited in Lines 20-21 should be moved to a location that directly follows the term

"structure," in Line 19, because this language also further modifies the language recited in Lines 11-16. In other words, all of the recited claim language in Lines 11-21 should be located in a single paragraph and should not be separated into multiple paragraphs having multiple indentations.

- The phrase "*fetched output data*" in Line 14 should be amended to — fetched retrieved output data — so that the claim terminology is consistent (see Line 13).

Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase "*the dynamic content further comprising java server pages referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report;*" in Lines 8-10 should be deleted because the phrase is subsequently recited in Lines 23-25 and is better located there.
- The phrase "*parsing and verification of the display data*" in Line 14 should be amended to — parsing and verification ~~of verifying~~ the display data — so that the phrase is grammatically correct.
- The term "*template*" in Lines 15 and 16 (two occurrences) should be amended to — page template — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 4).
- The phrase "*and generating further comprising*" in Line 15 should be amended to — and said generating further comprising — because the "*generating*" is previously recited in the claim (see Line 11).

- The claim language recited in Lines 17-21 should be moved to a location that directly follows the term “*template*,” in Line 16, because this language further modifies the language recited in Lines 11-16. In other words, all of the recited claim language in Lines 11-21 should be located in a single paragraph and should not be separated into multiple paragraphs having multiple indentations.
- The term “*retrieved*” in Line 19 should be amended to — ~~retrieved~~ fetched — so that the claim language is consistent (see Lines 12 and 20-21).
- The term “*and*” in Line 21 should be deleted because it is unnecessary.
- The phrase “*operable to interpret the predetermined syntax into the syntax of the output page*” in Lines 26-27 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for either the recited “*syntax*” of the output page or the recited “*output page*.”
- An additional tab indentation should be inserted before the phrase “*means for invoking*” in Line 29 and the phrase “*means for generating*” in Line 32 because these limitations further define the “*generating*” recited in Lines 11-16.
- The phrase “*operable to interpret the predetermined syntax into the syntax of the output page*” in Lines 26-27 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for either the recited “*syntax*” of the output page or the recited “*output page*.”
- The phrase “*invoking the javabean components for each of the metadata components*” in Lines 29-30 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for the recited “*metadata components*.”

- The phrase “*to perform processing using the retrieved display data*” in Line 30 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for the recited “*retrieved display data*.” Although the claim previously recites the “*display data*,” the claim does not mention any retrieval of the “*display data*.”
- The number “58” in Line 30 should be deleted because it appears to be a typographic error.
- The phrase “*to perform processing using . . . the output data*” in Lines 30-31 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for the recited “*output data*.”
- The phrase “*corresponding to each of the parsed metadata tokens*” in Lines 32-33 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for the recited “*parsed metadata tokens*.” Although the claim previously recites “*tokens*” that are “*parsed*,” the claim does not mention that these “*tokens*” are “*metadata tokens*.”

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*operable to interpret the predetermined syntax into the syntax of the output page*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for either the recited “*syntax*” of the output page or the recited “*output page*.”

- The phrase "*invokes javabean components for each of the metadata components*" in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*metadata components*."
- The phrase "*to perform processing using the retrieved display data*" in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*retrieved display data*." Although the claims previously recite the "*display data*," the claims do not mention any retrieval of the "*display data*."
- The number "58" in Line 5 should be deleted because it appears to be a typographic error.
- The phrase "*to perform processing using . . . the output data*" in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*output data*."
- The phrase "*corresponding to each of the parsed metadata tokens*" in Lines 6-7 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*parsed metadata tokens*." Although the claims previously recite "*tokens*" that are "*parsed*," the claims do not mention that these "*tokens*" are "*metadata tokens*."
- The comma at the end of Line 7 of the claim should be replaced with a period because all claims must end with a period.

- Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - The term “javabeans” in Line 2 should be amended to — javabean[[s]] components — because that is how the element is previously identified (see Claim 32, Line 2).
 - The phrase “*interpret the predetermined XML compliant syntax*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*predetermined XML compliant syntax*.” Although the claims previously recite the “*predetermined syntax*,” the claims do not mention an “*XML compliant*” syntax.
 - The phrase “*the metadata components*” in Line 3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*metadata components*.”

Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*operable to interpret the predetermined syntax into the syntax of the output page*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for either the recited “*syntax*” of the output page or the recited “*output page*.”
- The phrase “*invokes javabean components for each of the metadata components*” in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*metadata components*.”
- The phrase “*to perform processing using the retrieved display data*” in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the

recited “*retrieved display data.*” Although the claims previously recite the “*display data*,” the claims do not mention any retrieval of the “*display data*.”

- The number “58” in Line 5 should be deleted because it appears to be a typographic error.
- The phrase “*to perform processing using . . . the output data*” in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*output data*.”
- The phrase “*corresponding to each of the parsed metadata tokens*” in Lines 6-7 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for the recited “*parsed metadata tokens*.” Although the claims previously recite “*tokens*” that are “*parsed*,” the claims do not mention that these “*tokens*” are “*metadata tokens*.”
- The claim is a duplicate claim of Claim 32.

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*javabeans*” in Line 2 should be amended to — *javabean[[s]] components* — because that is how the element is previously identified (see Claim 34, Line 2).
- The phrase “*interpret the predetermined XML compliant syntax*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*predetermined XML compliant syntax*.” Although the claims previously

recite the "*predetermined syntax*," the claims do not mention an "*XML compliant*" syntax.

- The phrase "*the metadata components*" in Line 3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*metadata components*."
- The claim is a duplicate claim of Claim 33.

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase "*wherein the predetermined syntax comprises*" in Line 1 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*predetermined syntax*."
- The phrase "*operable to interpret the predetermined syntax into the syntax of the output page*" in Lines 2-3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for either the recited "*syntax*" of the output page or the recited "*output page*."
- The phrase "*invoking javabean components for each of the metadata components*" in Line 4 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*metadata components*."
- The phrase "*to perform processing using the retrieved display data*" in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited "*retrieved display data*." Although the claims previously recite the "*display data*," the claims do not mention any retrieval of the "*display data*."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-18, 22-25, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hefetz et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0123238 (hereinafter, "Hefetz").

Claim 1:

Hefetz discloses a *method for producing an output report* (see Figure 6 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure) *comprising*:

- *identifying a page template indicative of an output report having passive content, the passive content being static* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the page layout deployment system, when the portal receives a request from a user, obtains a template that includes static content);
- *parsing tokens from the page template, the tokens indicative of dynamic content, the dynamic content adapted to provide at least a portion of the output report* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see

- The phrase “*to perform processing using . . . the output data*” in Lines 4-5 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*output data*.”
- The phrase “*corresponding to each of the parsed metadata tokens*” in Lines 6-7 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claim for the recited “*parsed metadata tokens*.” Although the claims previously recite “*tokens*” that are “*parsed*,” the claims do not mention that these “*tokens*” are “*metadata tokens*.”

Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*javabeans*” in Line 2 should be amended to — *javabean[s]* components — because that is how the element is previously identified (see Claim 36, Line 2).
- The phrase “*interpret the predetermined XML compliant syntax*” in Line 2 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*predetermined XML compliant syntax*.” Although the claims previously recite the “*predetermined syntax*,” the claims do not mention an “*XML compliant*” syntax.
- The phrase “*the metadata components*” in Lines 2-3 should be amended because there is no antecedent basis in the claims for the recited “*metadata components*.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 30:

The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 30 recites a “*set of processor based instructions*” for producing a report. “*Instructions*” are not within a statutory class as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101 (i.e., a “process,” a “machine,” a “manufacture” or a “composition of matter”).

Additionally, as noted in the above claim objection, the subsequently recited “*processor*” (see Line 2) does not correspond to the previously recited portion of the claim because no computer, nor any other machine comprising a processor, is previously recited in the claim.

Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system parses the template for placeholders, locates the placeholders and replaces them with dynamic content to generate a web page in response to the user's request);

- *for each token, generating the dynamic content, generating further comprising fetching output data and processing display data, the output data operable to be retrieved from a dynamic repository and display data operable to indicate organization of the fetched output data* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews); and
- *building the output report by assembling the generated dynamic content for each token in the page template* (see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), *the dynamic content further comprising java server pages referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report* (see Figure 5; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0035; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system

translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 2:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

- *receiving a user request for an HTML page, wherein said building further comprises rendering the HTML page responsive to the user request* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0007; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system generates a web page in response to the user's request).

Claim 4:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said building the output report further comprises:*

- *receiving an HTTP request on behalf of a user, the HTTP request indicative of an HTML response* (see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system, when the portal receives a request from a user, generates the web page in response to the user's request);
- *determining the page template corresponding to the requested HTML response* (see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 →

Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system obtains the template based on the request that is received from the user);

- *generating, in a rendering engine, a JSP output page from the identified page template* (see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system generates the web page using JSP); and
- *transmitting the generated JSP output page to the user as an HTML page* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0007; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system transmits the web page in response to the user's request).

Claim 5:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the display data is formatted according to a predetermined syntax, the predetermined syntax operable for parsing and verification of the display data* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 6:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, wherein the predetermined syntax, the predetermined syntax is a different syntax than the template and generating further comprises interpreting the display data from the predetermined syntax into the syntax defining the template* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 7:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, wherein the predetermined syntax includes syntactical elements, and is further operable for nesting the syntactical elements, the nested syntactical elements defining a hierarchical structure* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 8:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, wherein the dynamic content is active content and the predetermined syntax conforms to XML, in which the syntactical elements further comprise XML tags* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 9:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 8, wherein the predetermined syntax is a page descriptor syntax defined by an XML schema* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 10:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the tokens are metadata tokens* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content), *further comprising*:

- *parsing the metadata tokens from the page template, each of the metadata tokens indicative of dynamic content* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system parses the template for placeholders, locates the placeholders and replaces them with dynamic content to generate a web page in response to the user's request);
- *retrieving, from a metadata repository, metadata components corresponding to the metadata tokens and operable to provide the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata token* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system

translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content);

- *retrieving, based on the metadata components, the display data and the output data from a repository, the display data and output data corresponding to the dynamic content for rendering on the output report* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews);
- *processing the metadata components using the retrieved display data and output data to generate the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata token* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews); and
- *inserting the dynamic content in the output report by replacing the metadata token* (see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

Claim 11:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 10, wherein the metadata components further comprise page descriptors, the page descriptors conforming to a declarative syntax and indicative of the dynamic content* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 14:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the display data further comprises user specific views, the user specific views indicative of formatting and display preference specific to a particular user and operable for interpretation by syntax processing components to render the display data according to the user specific views* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system personalizes the views presented to particular users).

Claim 15:

Claim 15 merely recites a device that performs the methods of Claims 1 and 5-7. Thus, Claim 15 is rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 5-7.

Claims 16-18, 22-25 and 28:

Claims 16-18, 22-25 and 28 merely recite a device that performs the methods of Claims 2, 1, 4, 8-11 and 14, respectively. Thus, Claims 16-18, 22-25 and 28 are rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 2, 1, 4, 8-11 and 14.

Claim 30:

Claim 30 merely recites instructions for performing the methods of Claims 1 and 5-7. Thus, Claim 30 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejection for Claims 1 and 5-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 29 and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hefetz, in view of Sulistio et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,036,072 (hereinafter, "Sulistio").

Claim 12:

As indicated in the above rejection, Hefetz discloses every limitation of Claim 1. Hefetz also discloses that *the parsing further comprises identifying a software component operable to process the metadata token, wherein the metadata component is retrieved and processed by the software component* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Hefetz fails to expressly disclose:

- *identifying a javabean operable to process the metadata token.*

Sulistio teaches a system for handling documents in electronic commerce, comprising:

- *javabeans operable to act upon a document* (see Figures 7, 8 and 19; see Column 5, Line 34 through Column 6, Line 57; see Column 37, Line 58 through Column 38, Line 20 → Sulistio teaches this limitation in that the system processes XML documents using schemas and javabeans to make declarative transformations of the documents),

for the purpose of simplifying the processing of documents using declarative methods and components (see Column 2, Lines 13-19).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Hefetz, to include:

- *identifying a javabean operable to process the metadata token,*

for the purpose of simplifying the processing of documents using declarative methods and components, as taught by Sulistio.

Claim 13:

Hefetz discloses *metadata components [that] are XML files including at least one page descriptor according to the predetermined syntax, and processing [that] further comprises retrieving the page descriptors by the software components and producing HTML code corresponding to the page descriptors* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1,

Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claims 26 and 27:

Claims 26 and 27 merely recite a device that performs the methods of Claims 12 and 13, respectively. Thus, Claims 26 and 27 are rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 13.

Claim 29:

Claim 29 merely recites computer software for performing the methods of Claim 1, 5, 10 and 12. Thus, Claim 29 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 5, 10 and 12.

Claim 31:

Claim 31 merely recites a device for performing the methods of Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12. Thus, Claim 31 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12.

Claims 32 and 34:

Claims 32 and 34 merely recite a device for performing the methods of Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12. Thus, Claims 32 and 34 are rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12.

Claims 33 and 35:

Claims 33 and 35 merely recite a device for performing the methods of Claims 12 and 13. Thus, Claims 33 and 35 are rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 13.

Claim 36:

The subject matter recited in Claim 36 corresponds to the recited limitations of Claims 10 and 12. Thus, Claim 36 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 10 and 12.

Claim 37:

The subject matter recited in Claim 37 corresponds to the recited limitations of Claims 12 and 13. Thus, Claim 37 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 13.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Applicant argues that Hefetz fails to disclose “*referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report*” because Hefetz fails to disclose such metalanguage references. Applicant appears to suggest that the recited limitation is distinguished from the third party toolkits (i.e., iViews, ILayoutStructure) for switching placeholder content to actual content that are disclosed in Hefetz. See *Response – Pages 18-19*, spanning paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The examiner notes that Applicant fails to specifically state in detail how the recited limitation is distinguished from the disclosure of Hefetz. The Specification of the present application provides no detail regarding the “*metalanguage representations*” of

the “*other java server pages*.” In the “Detailed Description” section of the Specification, the “*metalinguage representations*” of the “*other java server pages*” is mentioned only once (see Page 14, Lines 12-14) and provides no details about what this language means.

The examiner will interpret the limitation (i.e., “*the dynamic content further comprising java server pages referencing metalinguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report*”¹) according to its plain meaning. Using the plain meaning of the limitation, the examiner interprets the limitation to indicate that the dynamic content includes JSPs referencing other JSPs. In other words, the dynamic content includes nested JSPs.

Hefetz discloses a portal-based networked environment that allows client computers to access data over a network through a portal. The portal can receive information from web applications (e.g., web services) to fulfill requests from the client computers. The information can be dynamic content, and the applications can be dynamic content sources. The portal can be integrated with an enterprise management system that consolidates multiple application services. The integrated enterprise management system can provide integrated application services to manage business objects and processes in a business enterprise, thereby consolidating and integrating the data and functionality of multiple different applications into a single enterprise management tool provided through the portal. See Hefetz – Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0035.

Hefetz discloses a portal page template that provides run-time translators corresponding to page elements defined in the template. At run-time, the translators are invoked. Upon invoking the translators, one or more content components are obtained for each page element, and the corresponding page element is translated into a presentation of the obtained one or more content elements. See Hefetz – Pages 4-5, Paragraphs 0040-0044.

Hefetz discloses that the content presented via the portal includes JSPs. See Hefetz – Page 1, Paragraph 0003 and Pages 2-3; Paragraph 0024. Thus, Hefetz discloses obtaining JSPs as dynamic content for inclusion into the web page/web application that is presented to the user and obtaining one or more content components for each page element on the web page. The examiner interprets this disclosure to include obtaining nested JSPs for inclusion into the web page/web application as dynamic content. Also, as indicated in Copeland, et al., US 6,877,025, web pages/web applications having dynamic content comprising nested JSPs were well known to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made (see Copeland – Column 4, Lines 10-30).

Accordingly, Hefetz discloses dynamic content further comprising "*java server pages referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report*," as recited in the claims.

Applicant argues that Hefetz fails to disclose generating dynamic content via "*fetching output data and processing display data*" because Hefetz merely selectively switches between placeholders and actual data. Applicant remarks that Hefetz merely invokes external toolkits and makes no distinction or clarification concerning the claimed output data operable to be retrieved from a dynamic repository and display data operable to indicate organization of the fetched output data. See *Response* – Page 19, first full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Switching between placeholders and actual data is only a very small portion of what Hefetz discloses. As indicated in the above discussion, Hefetz also discloses obtaining dynamic content for a web page/web application during run-time. Furthermore, Hefetz discloses storage mediums from which the dynamic content is obtained and a user-roles based system that allows personalized tailoring of a presented interface through the generated information views. See Hefetz – Pages 3-5, Paragraphs 0033, 0036, 0037 and 0042.

Accordingly, Hefetz discloses "*fetching output data and processing display data*," wherein the output data operable to be retrieved from a dynamic repository and the display data operable to indicate organization of the fetched output data, as recited in the claims.

Applicant argues that Hefetz fails to disclose a predetermined syntax because the predetermined template in the present invention need not be the same syntax as the

template [sic]. In the examiner's opinion, it appears that Applicant meant to argue that the display data is formatted in syntax that is different from the syntax of the page template (see Claim 15, Lines 12-17). See *Response* – Page 20, first paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Hefetz discloses that JSP templates can contain any HTML, Java, custom tags defined in a tag library, or other JSP complying content, that is to be included in the web pages/web applications. The layout containers in the templates can hold multiple iViews, HTML tags and HTMLB (HTML-Business for Java) tags. Additional container properties, such as portal application definitions, may be stored in XML documents. Page layout definitions are stored in a portal content directory. See Hefetz – Pages 5-7, Paragraphs 0048-0059. Thus, the containers of the templates can obtain layout information that is described in a different syntax than the templates.

Accordingly, Hefetz discloses a “*predetermined syntax*” for “*display data*” that is different from the syntax of the page template, as recited in the claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is 571-272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
April 21, 2007


Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100